

APPLICANT(S): YADAV, Satyendra  
SERIAL NO.: 10/603,801  
FILED: June 26, 2003  
Page 5

### REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

Applicant asserts that the present invention as claimed is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

### Status of Claims

Claims 1, 7, 11, 14, 15, 18, 23, 31 -34 are pending in the application. Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-13, 16-17, 19-22 and 24-30 have been canceled. In making this cancellation without prejudice, Applicant reserves all rights in these claims to file divisional and/or continuation patent applications. Claims 1, 7, 11, 14, 15, 18 and 23 have been amended. New claims 31-34 have been added

New claims 31-34 have been added to further define what the Applicant considers to be the invention. Applicant respectfully asserts that the additions to and amendments to the claims add no new matter.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS

#### 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Aljadeff et al. U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0232598 ("Aljadeff"). Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 7, 11, 14, 15, 18 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn in view of the remarks that follow. Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-13, 16, 17, 19-22 and 24-30 have been canceled without prejudice and, therefore, the rejection of these claims is now moot.

In order to successfully assert a prima facie case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art document that includes every element and limitation of the claim or claims being rejected. Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended, includes "determining a location of a client by determining a direction of a source of a signal received from said client." Aljaderff teaches several possible location determination methods but does not teach or suggest determining a location of a client by determining a direction of a source of a signal

APPLICANT(S): YADAV, Satyendra  
SERIAL NO.: 10/603,801  
FILED: June 26, 2003  
Page 6

received from a client. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection be withdrawn in respect of Applicant's independent claim 1 as amended.

Applicant's dependent claim 7 and Applicant's dependent claims 11 and 14, as amended, depend directly from Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended, and thereby include at least all of the elements of such independent claim 1, as amended. Furthermore, Applicant's dependent claim 7 includes "using a location fingerprint to determine said location of said client". Aljaderff does not teach or suggest using a location fingerprint to determine a location of a client. Applicant's dependent claim 11, as amended, includes "recording instances of attempts to gain access to said wireless local area network from outside a boundary". Aljaderff does not teach or suggest recording instances of attempts to gain access to a wireless local area network from outside a boundary. Applicant's dependent claim 14, as amended, includes "accepting signals from a signal receiver of a signal receiver pair wherein a first receiver of said signal receiver pair is to determine a location of a client relative to a permitted area, and a second receiver of said signal receiver pair is to transmit data to said client." Aljaderff does not teach or suggest accepting signals from a signal receiver of a signal receiver pair wherein a first receiver of such signal receiver pair is to determine a location of a client relative to a permitted area, and a second receiver of such signal receiver pair is to transmit data to a client. For at least these reasons, Applicant asserts that dependent claims 7, 11 and 14, as amended are likewise allowable. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of dependent claims 7 11 and 14, as amended.

Applicant's independent claim 15, as amended, includes "first and second signal receivers . . . wherein said first signal receiver is to determine a location of said client relative to said permitted area, and said second signal receiver is to transmit data to said client". Aljaderff does not teach or suggest first and second signal receivers wherein a first signal receiver is to determine a location of a client relative to a permitted area, and a second signal receiver is to transmit data to a client. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection be withdrawn in respect of Applicant's independent claim 15 as amended.

Applicant's dependent claims 18 and 23, as amended, depend directly from Applicant's independent claim 15, as amended, and thereby include at least all of the

APPLICANT(S): YADAV, Satyendra  
SERIAL NO.: 10/603,801  
FILED: June 26, 2003  
Page 7

elements of such independent claim 15, as amended. Furthermore, Applicant's dependent claim 18 requires, that "said second receiver is an access point, and wherein said first receiver includes a wireless component whose location is known". Aljaderff does not teach or suggest a system having a second receiver being an access point, and wherein a first receiver includes a wireless component whose location is known. Applicant's dependent claim 23, as amended, includes first and second signal receivers that are signal receivers of a signal receiver pair. Aljaderff does not teach or suggest a system having first and second signal receivers that are signal receivers of a signal receiver pair. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of dependent claims 18 and 23, as amended.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 7, 11, 14, 15, 18, and 23.

#### **Remarks to New Claims**

New claims 31-34 have been added to further define subject matter included in the scope of the present invention.

No new matter has been added.

New claim 31 depends indirectly from claim 1, which as provided above is allowable, and incorporates all the elements of at least claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 31 is patentable, and thus allowable, at least for the reasons set forth above.

New independent claim 32 recites "receiving location data of a client at an authentication system of a local area network". Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the prior art or record, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention, and therefore do not anticipate claim 32, and do not render claim 32 obvious.

Accordingly, independent claim 32 is in condition for allowance.

Each one of claims 33-34 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 32 and incorporate all the elements of claim 32. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 33-34 are patentable, and thus allowable, at least for the reasons set forth above.

APPLICANT(S): YADAV, Satyendra  
SERIAL NO.: 10/603,801  
FILED: June 26, 2003  
Page 8

### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,



Naim Shichur

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Registration No. 56,248

Dated: July 25, 2005

**Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP**  
10 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 1001  
New York, New York 10020  
Tel: (212) 632-3480  
Fax: (212) 632-3489